

The Shakespeare Newsletter

VOL. I, No. 2

"Knowing I lov'd my books, he furnish'd me . . ."

APRIL, 1951

Romeo and Juliet Closes After Six Weeks

Although Olivia de Havilland had planned for years to act the part of Juliet and had gone through many difficulties to find a producer to stage the play, the production did not meet with enthusiasm. It opened at the Broadhurst Theatre on March 10 and closed its doors after 49 performances, on April 21. Jane Cowl's *Romeo and Juliet* ran for 157 performances in 1923—a record exceeded only by Paul Robeson's *Othello* (1946) 280, and Katherine Hepburn's *As You Like It* (1950), 145 performances. The following review summaries indicate some of the opinions.

Romeo and Juliet "misses fire," and because Olivia de Havilland had so much to do with the production the "failure tends to be . . . a personal one for the title actress." By expert use of scenery the action moves from scene to scene without pause. The scenes and costumes are stunning but a trifle ornate. It is a sedate "low voltage" performance which "allows the melodrama of young passion and violence to subside into little more than an animated pageant." Miss de Havilland is pretty but lacks the "temperament or technical resources" the part demands. She seems a finishing school graduate and becomes impressive only after Tybalt's death. The surrounding cast is also disappointing. The script is played virtually intact in two acts. (Hobe Morrison, *Variety*, March 14, p. 50.)

Brooks Atkinson found the production impressive and Juliet acted with a "good deal of personal enchantment." Although he found her substituting her beauty for acting, and reading her lines in "sing-song" manner in early scenes, he found her gathering strength as the lyricism faded, and the gravity mounted. Douglas Watson (Romeo), and Jack Hawkins (Mercutio) have "authority in their acting," but "as speakers of poetry, they are lamentably inferior." Mr. Atkinson believes "we are still in the mauve decade in Shakespearean production" and objects to 19th century scenery which is vivid and beautiful but so copious that "there is enough of it to house a good-sized village and to swamp a whole platoon of actors." Such taste "would be obsolete if Shakespearean producing had kept pace with the rest of the theatre." (*The New York Times*, March 12, p. 21.)

PROVINCETOWN PLAYHOUSE

A performance of *Much Ado* at the Provincetown Playhouse in NYC on March 31 showed some weakness but rather excellent acting by John Frances as Benedict and Alexander Maisel as Dogberry. The script was prepared by Prof. Elizabeth Stein of Hunter College.

"To be, or not to be . . ."

When on March 29 Alan Keen announced to the world that he had "established" that his copy of Hall's *Chronicle* contained copious notes written by William Shakespeare, he was reviving a controversy which has raged in scholarly journals for the past eleven years.

Keen purchased the volume on June 22, 1940 at which time his curiosity was aroused when he noticed that the lines "*In Terram Salicam* . . ." which occur in *Henry V* had been underscored by an early possessor who had written in the margin, "Note the exposition." After examining the 406 marginal notes, pointing finger, crosses, underlinings, and a drawing of a "man's head," the following observations were made over a ten year period—none of them based on a similarity of handwriting.

The notes seem to have been made by one who apparently had the construction of a play in mind; nearly everything noted was
(Concluded on page 3)

Shakhisbeard at

Finnegans Wake

WILLIAM PEERY
University of Texas

Alongside Vico, Bruno, Freud, and Lewis Carroll we must put down, as influences upon Joyce's *Finnegans Wake*, the name of Shakespeare. To him or his works Joyce refers in the *Wake* at least fifty-five times.

Shakespeare's name is there spelled almost as variously as in Elizabethan documents. Never, however, does it receive any of the spellings for which there is contemporary authority. It appears as Shikespower, shaggs-pick, Shakhisbeard, Cheekspair, Shakefork, Great Shapessphere, Sheepskeer, and Shopkeeper. Most of these distortions are devices used to point up the many brother-battles which provide much of the incident in the *Wake*. They usually express Shaun's contempt for the profession of letters or of Shem's literary pretensions; for like Stephen in *Ulysses*, Shem conceives of himself as Shakespeare.

The titles of ten Shakespearean plays appear in eleven parodies in the *Wake*, usually with fine relevance to context. The remaining references—quotations, parodies, and allusions—assist Joyce in his portrayal of the archetypal brother-battles and afford some extension of the characters of the brothers and their father into a larger mythology. Like all the Shakespearean content, they add richness to the *Wake's* fascinating verbal texture, which is seen to be not madness but method, or as Joyce says, "chaosmos."

The foregoing is an abstract of a paper which will appear in full in the forthcoming issue of the *University of Texas Studies in English*, 1951.

The Shakespeare Jubilee In Retrospect

When the booming of thirty cannon awakened the inhabitants of Stratford-upon-Avon on the morning of September 6, 1769 they little realized that this celebration in honor of Shakespeare would set a precedent which would last for centuries.

On that day bands serenaded, bells rang, processions marched, oratorios, catches, and glees were sung, toasts were drunk, David Garrick cheered, great dinners were served, and all sang "God Save the King"—and Shakespeare. A "truly elegant" amphitheatre supported inside by 12 Corinthian columns had been constructed for the occasion—but the 800 candle chandelier, for some reason or other, was not used. Here a great ball and an outdoor display of fireworks ended the spectacular festivities of the first day. Rain dampened the proceedings on the following two days and the procession of Shakespearean characters had to be dropped, but the delivering of speeches, odes, the music, fireworks, and balls continued. There was some dramatic activity but no Shakespeare. The three days of excitement were no doubt symbolized in the playlet entitled *Garrick's Vagary: or England Run Mad*.

It all began when George Steevens suggested that David Garrick's self-esteem might be prevailed upon to provide a portrait of himself to fill an empty niche in the newly completed Town Hall. The plan worked. Garrick did send his Gainsborough portrait and planned the Jubilee festival as well.

Although minor jubilees were planned and one by Edmund Malone laid aside in 1794 because of gloom over the revolution in France, none took place until the *Shakespearean Club of Stratford-upon-Avon* shot cannon and struck a medal in 1826 and planned a triennial jubilee the first of which was to take place in 1827. Mr. Palmer took his cue from the previous celebration. Cannon, bells, music, and fireworks sounded the praise of Shakespeare. The Tragic Muse drawn by four fiends was followed by costumed characters from the tragedies; the Comic Muse drawn by satyrs was followed by characters from the comedies; St. George in armor, officials in sashes, club banners, national flags, and houses decorated with laurel added color to the occasion. Shakespeare busts were crowned with laurel, speeches delivered, a corner stone for a theatre laid, and Shakespeare.

(Concluded on page 2)

SHAKESPEARE MEMORIAL

When Miss June Justice laid the wreath on Shakespeare's statue in Central Park, N. Y., on April 23, she was continuing an annual tradition started by Sir Philip Ben Greet in 1910.

The Shakespeare Newsletter

Published at 749 Franklin D. Roosevelt Dr., N. Y. 9

Editor & Publisher

LOUIS MARDER, Ph.D.

Department of English
Brooklyn College, School of General Studies
Brooklyn 10, N. Y.

Published Monthly—September through June

Annual Subscription \$1.00

Copyright 1951 by
LOUIS MARDER

VOL. I, No. 2

APRIL, 1951

Shakespearean Microcosm

The Shakespearean world, like the world around us, is filled with chaos amid plenty. In the last issue of *SNL* we saw Stoll at odds with Stewart, and in this current issue we see Bateson *vs* Hotson, Nemerow *vs* Stauffer & Farnham (who are attacked as proxies for many others), Wilson *vs* Alexander, Greg, and Chambers, Hallet Smith *vs* faulty projectors, and Alan Keen *vs* bibliographical skeptics.

While the situation is not conducive to absolute harmony, it certainly does reveal a salubrious state of criticism and scholarship. Neither tyro nor professor can make a statement without really thinking about repercussions.

That pressure to publish puts into print much that is not the result of calm and deliberate conviction will not be denied, but that is only half the story. *Is there too much background?* Jaggard's bibliography lists 36,000 entries, Raven's of *Hamlet* has 2167 entries, six of Tannenbaum's bibliographies have 13,474 items, the *Shakespeare Quarterly* bibliography records over 300 items annually, and Muir tells us that much remains to be done.

It is no wonder that a *TLS* writer declared in 1947 that "The time must be near at hand when Shakespearean criticism will be destroyed by cumulative weight." But no! Even in the 18th century Steevens had had to disparage the remark that Shakespeare had been "elucidated into obscurity." There can never be too much. The trouble is that it is either unknown or unavailable.

What we need is *synthesis* and order. Halliday's *Shakespeare and his Critics*, Holzknecht's *Backgrounds of Shakespeare's Plays*, and Variorum editions supply stepping stones, but the annual deluge makes them obsolete on publication.

A tentative proposal to remedy this situation will be made in the next *SNL*. Here we can at least quote Muir's remark in *Shakespeare Survey IV*:

The study of character, plot, imagery, symbolism, stage conventions and language, though all legitimate methods, would gain enormously by being used together. This is a consummation devoutly to be wished, but unlikely to be achieved."

When it comes to matters of criticism and interpretation — even of facts — we are all rugged individualists.

Shakespeare Jubilee

(Continued from page 1)

spere's epitaph sung by an amateur choir. All went well; there was no rain and all the suspicious characters had been sent away or placed in custody.

The next jubilee was held in 1830, but despite the success which brought 25,000 visitors to the town no public celebration was held until the tercentenary celebration in 1864. After that year festivals were held at frequent intervals until the opening of the Memorial Theatre in 1879 made the festival an annual event. The 1950 festival had special significance because for the first time in recorded history a reigning monarch came to Stratford.

But the main feature in our own time is not the cannon, bells, music, and balls, nor even the lectures or the unfurling of the flags of the United Nations. The chief drawing card today is the performance of Shakespeare's plays by the company of the Shakespeare Memorial Theatre which this year is entering its ninety-second season. A strong cast under the direction of Anthony Quayle is now performing a repertory which before the season is over will include *Richard II*, *Henry IV* Parts 1 and 2, *Henry V*, and *The Tempest*. The theatre has this year been remodeled to seat the 350,000 expected from Mar. 24 to Oct. 27—the longest season on record.

Your humble servant,

I wish to send sincere thanks for the many heart-warming and encouraging letters I have received, for your subscriptions, for the literary notes, for proffered assistance, and for the names of students and Shakespeareans submitted by subscribers and Chairmen of English Departments. To the latter I appeal once again for the names of those who give Shakespeare electives. Information as to Shakespearean productions, news items, articles or abstracts, names of Shakespeare Clubs—any interesting Shakespeareana—will be gratefully received and acknowledged.

The editor.

P.S.: Your friends and students may also be interested. Student rate is 75c. Why not send your subscription and suggestions NOW as you think of it? — Sincerely, lm

SHAKESPEARE STUDIES

ELMER EDGAR STOLL

Eight critical essays on a comparative and historical basis.

On the Anniversary of a Folio—The Ghosts—Literature and Life—The Characterisation—The Comic Method—Shylock—The Criminals—Falstaff.

512 pages. Indexed. Cloth. \$4.00

SHAKESPEARE LEXIKON

ALEXANDER SCHMIDT

A complete dictionary of all the English words, phrases and constructions that are found in the works of the poet.

Fourth edition by Gregor Sarrazin.

2 volumes. 1490 pages. Cloth. \$20.00

Hafner Publishing Co.

31 East 10th St., New York 3

Shakespeare Survey IV

The forthcoming *Shakespeare Survey IV* edited by Allardyce Nicoll (Cambridge University Press, 1951) continues to live up to the expectation of its readers. These annual volumes will always be of value because no one can disagree with Kenneth Muir's assertion—in his review of "Fifty Years of Shakespearean Criticism"—that "The yearly flood of Shakespeareana submerges all but the strongest swimmers and makes it increasingly difficult to see Shakespeare steadily, and see him whole.

Beginning with the state of Shakespearean criticism in 1900, Mr. Muir briefly but acutely compartmentalizes the "Bradleyites," the different approaches, the disintegrators and re-integrators, the "School of Knight," etc. But he is forced to conclude that despite all that has been done, a great deal yet remains to be explored and re-explored in the light of new criteria.

Similar in scope and overlapping in some details are the three valuable essays which constitute "The Year's Contribution to Shakespearean Study." From these and from J. Dover Wilson's printed lecture on "Malone and the Upstart Crow" it can be observed that the integrity of the canon is still a matter of doubt. Wilson had long entertained some doubts as to the totality of the conclusions of Alexander and his supporters, but when he re-read *Henry VI* he was struck, just as Theobald and Malone were, with "the extraordinary inequality of style and temper in all three parts." His continued conviction that Greene's attack can only mean outright plagiarism will undoubtedly stir up a mare's nest of controversy. He almost regrets that only two of the five great scholars who allegedly settled the controversy are left in the field to oppose him.

Hardin Craig's essay on "Motivation in Shakespeare's Choice of Materials," makes revealing comments on Shakespeare's use of imagination in his treatment of sources, and M. C. Bradbrook contributes another study—"The Sources of Macbeth"—which, with the former, should revive interest in the interpretation of Shakespeare's use of his raw materials. For those who despair that all important documents have been uncovered, Levi Fox's note on "An Early Copy of Shakespeare's Will" should provide inspiration for further search. Essays on Shakespeare's use of language, the Shakespeare collection in the Bodleian, several theatrical studies, and fourteen plates round out the contents.

There is something here for every Shakespearean palate. Because of the high quality of its contents, the authority of the contributors, the nature of the criticism, and the universality of its scope, *The Shakespeare Survey* still remains the most important annual contribution to Shakespearean scholarship and criticism.

The Taming of the Shrew starring Claire Luce opened at the City Center in N. Y. on April 25th.

An Introduction to SHAKESPEARE

by

MARCHETTE CHUTE

Author of

SHAKESPEARE OF LONDON

\$2.25

"This book should be in the
hands of every high-school student."

—Virginia Kirkus

E. P. DUTTON & COMPANY

New York 10, N. Y.

Elizabethan Pageantry

It is seldom that a book focused on a narrow aspect of a subject is able to enhance our appreciation of the whole, but Alice Venezky's *Pageantry on the Shakespearean Stage*, (N. Y., Twayne, 1951), succeeds in this respect with remarkable effectiveness.

By vividly recreating the sounds, sights, smells, pomp and circumstance of every aspect of Elizabethan pageantry, Dr. Venezky not only succeeds in presenting a dynamic commentary on Elizabethan stage practice, but portrays a realistic panorama of Elizabethan London as well.

Illuminating comments on Elizabethan life reveal that Pistol's puzzling "*semper idem*" may be reminiscent of Elizabeth's own motto often carried in official processions; and Marcus' description of the mutilated Lavinia "like a conduit with three issuing spouts" may have reminded Elizabethans of their own conduits which were made to flow with wine to symbolize prosperity at royal receptions. We see the fallen monarch made more abject by some reference to his former triumphal processions. And, as a sideline, she is able to corroborate Fletcher's work in *Henry VIII* by showing that the pageantry description is not in Shakespeare's manner.

Her relentless observation has given her such profuse detail that she can illuminate a large section of the drama with references to pageants, triumphs, progresses, tableaux, dumb shows, amateur performances, etc. What were hazy images before, now become vividly alive and more dramatically effective.

The *Romeo and Juliet* production represented an investment of \$175,000 which includes a \$35,000 loss from its prior six week road tour.

The Philadelphia Shakespeare Club is the oldest in the U.S. having been founded in 1851 by three lawyers and a student. The first regular meeting took place in Oct., 1852, and the first election in the 1858-9 season. They originally called themselves the Apostles . . . The second oldest club is The Shakespeare Club of Morristown which this year will celebrate its 75th anniversary.

Alan Keen

(Continued from page 1)

used by Shakespeare; there are frequent parallelisms in language; the annotator used rare words in the Shakespearean sense; Hall begins where Shakespeare does—with the dispute of Mowbray and Bolingbroke; the misprint *Elve* for *Elbe* occurs in both Hall and the Folio version of *Henry V*; the annotator knew Latin; the words "illustrate" and "undubitate" occur in the title page of Hall and in Armado's letter in *Love's Labour's Lost*; he knew something of the drama because the name *Thomas of Woodstock* is supplied in the margin next to a mention of the Duke of Gloucester and there was a play of that title c. 1591-4; the annotator was obviously a Catholic; he was poetically minded; and a relationship can be traced between the original owner of the book, Sir Richard Newport of High Ercall, and Shakespeare.

That the 3600 words of notes are in Shakespeare's handwriting remains to be proved, and that the parallelisms are not always valid is revealed in Moray McLaren's reprint of a number of them in 1949. If the *Elve* in the Folio came from this book Mr. Keen would have to prove that the printer used Shakespeare's own manuscript. It can also be argued that the annotator might have been impressed by those very portions which later impressed Shakespeare, and that the comments were made for personal reasons rather than for ultimate dramatization. It must also be pointed out that the annotations stop at Henry VI's reign—and did not Shakespeare treat that monarch also?

The evidence that is claimed to clear up the lost years of Shakespeare's life—1585-1592—is based on the interrelation through law, marriage, tutorial service, etc., of the Newports with Shakespeare and other related families. A great deal also depends on the still to be proved assertion that Shakespeare and Shakeshafte are one and the same. Both names occur often enough to cause confusion.

Whether or not the volume turns out to be Shakespeare's, Mr. Keen and some others have brought to light some interesting marital, legal, and literary relationships. He has also increased the value of a £5 volume at least one-hundred-fold. Messrs. Wright and McManaway of the Folger Shakespeare Library have publicly expressed the skepticism which most Shakespeareans justifiably entertain.

SCOOP: The N. Y. City Center is planning a 6 weeks Shakespeare Festival for 1952.

L. McCormick-Goodhart of Bellapais, Alexandria, Va., is collecting numismatic commemorative and other material relating to Shakespeare and would welcome correspondence leading to the acquisition of items of interest.

ENGLAND: *Hamlet* opened at the Guildford Repertory with Laurence Payne in the title role on Feb. 12 . . . Another *Hamlet* with Alec Guinness will open at the New Theatre in London on May 17th . . . *Kiss Me Kate* with Patricia Morrison in the title role opened at the London Coliseum on March 8th.

THE SOURCES OF MUCH ADO ABOUT NOTHING

CHARLES T. PROUTY

The purpose of this study is to estimate as nearly as possible the significance of the source materials of this play to Shakespeare and his audience. Of major interest is the fact that Peter Beverley's *The Historie of Ariodanto and Ieneura*, an adaptation from the *Orlando Furioso* long thought to be lost, is here reprinted for the first time.

\$2.50

HAMLET'S FATHER

RICHARD FLATTER

A well-known Shakespearean scholar advances new and convincing explanations of the various problems in *Hamlet* that have long perplexed students.

\$3.75

YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS

New Haven, Conn.

REVIEW OF PERIODICALS:

Leslie Hotson is subjected to scholarly censure by F. W. Bateson of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, who asserts that the dating of the *Sonnets* "provides a nice example of the limitations of pure scholarship." After reviewing some comments of those who agree with Hotson, he insists that sonnet 107 is "only incidentally a historical document," and maintains that criteria for judgment must rest solely on literary grounds.

Mr. Bateson's poetic interpretation is that the sonnet is organized as a "parallel" which terminates in a contrasting couplet. The first quatrain concerns Shakespeare's private world; the second, the "contemporary public world"; the third establishes a connection between them; and the final couplet "asserts the superiority of the private world." To deny the interrelation of these parts is "to deny the sonnet's poetic coherence."

Since the second quatrain must introduce something for public affection to contrast with the first quatrain, the Armada cannot possibly be implied. Furthermore, Elizabeth had often been referred to as Diana (a cited letter makes similar analogies), the "mortal Moone" might as readily imply a full moon as a crescent (and in Shakespeare it is always round except in *Macbeth* (III.5.23-4) which Bateson thinks is in an interpolated scene), and eclipses cannot take place except at a full moon, which Shakespeare must have known.

In addition to this evidence Bateson further attacks Hotson's "desperate conclusion" that the sonnet and its predecessors must have been written about 1588 on the ground that the numerous "verbal antitheses" of *Venus and Adonis* and *The Rape of Lucrece* are not found in them. Could Shakespeare have achieved a fine style and then reverted for a few years to one much less developed? "*Quod est absurdum*." "Literary detection is a harmless avocation," but the literary rules must be observed. ("Elementary, My dear Hotson! *A Caveat for Literary Detectives*," *Essays in Criticism*, I:1, pp. 81-88, Jan. 1951.)

REVIEW of PERIODICALS

Arthur Sherbo of the University of Illinois has minutely examined Samuel Johnson's notes to *Macbeth* in his *Miscellaneous Observations* (1745) and found that 27 of the 46 were either changed or omitted when the edition of 1765 was prepared for the press. He omitted compliments to Warburton, blunders and erroneous emendations, remarked that "All this coil is to little purpose" where he disagreed with a predecessor, omitted emendations where he had proposed words to regularize the text, corrected previous emendations, etc. Dr. Sherbo further notes that of 85 additional notes, 33 are corrections of, or disagreements with Warburton, 35 involve interpretation of the text, and the rest make comments on other editors, stage directions, etc. Johnson quoted his own *Dictionary* as an authority in 30 instances. The notes to *Macbeth* reveal that Johnson's indolence made him rely on his previous efforts. "The comparison reveals little evidence of heightened esthetic or critical insight in Johnson." ("Dr. Johnson on *Macbeth*: 1745 and 1765," *Review of English Studies*, II-5, pp. 40-47, Jan. 1951.)

Some rather caustic comments are made by Howard Nemerow in a review article based on Willard Farnham's *Shakespeare's Tragic Frontier*, and Donald Stauffer's *Shakespeare's World of Images*. Mr. Nemerow objects to the "conventional language of literary apology" which also does the duty of bibliography, and cites Prof. Farnham's remark that "it is perhaps impossible to write a completely useless book about him; each book is a hand pointing back to Shakespeare, and that is always a public service." A parallel remark by Prof. Stauffer is also cited. Objection is made to dependence on established chronology, speculation as to sources, writing about the characters rather than the play, conversion of good poetry into bad prose, and neglect of the new critics. Both books are "in the tradition." Mr. Nemerow wants books that add an "instrument" or an "authoritative idea" to our power of reading the plays. ("Public Service and Pointing Hands," *Sevanee Review*, LIX:1, pp.161-67, Winter, 1951.)

Prof. Hallet Smith of the California Institute of Technology surveys the 19th and 20th century attempts to "visualize" Shakespeare and finds most of them more revealing of the projector than of Shakespeare. The differences between the results are based on differing temperaments, differing techniques for making the analysis, differing theories of "the nature of creative genius," and the "reflection of the period in which they were made . . . Every century has its own Shakespeare." Because of the inherent mystery due to a paucity of facts, projections continue to be made. James Joyce, himself an exile, believed Shakespeare's preoccupation with banishment autobiographical. Shaw's projection is allegedly based on "the destruction of an ideal father image by his own drunken father." Attempts to reconcile Shakespeare with his works are countered with efforts to show that there is no correlation. In some writers such as Mark Twain, himself a self-made man, the projections "is often enough that of his opposite." These projectors must have a noble Shakespeare. Caution—founded on 19th century bardolatry makes the current interpreters base themselves on "a balance" between Shakespeare's own "participating experience" and what he got "from books, the talk of his friends, and his own imagination." The analysis of images and "image clusters" adds the psychological method to the new approach. By such investigation he fears the projectors may tell us too much, but he concludes with the answer to Hippolyta by Theseus, "The best of this kind are but shadows; and the worst one no worse, if imagination amend them." ("In Search of Shakespeare," *The Yale Review*, XL, pp. 471-483, Spring, 1951.)

The Countess Longworth Chambrun reasserts her conviction that Christopher Marlowe is the "greater spirit"—the rival poet Shakespeare alludes to in his Sonnets. That Shakespeare admired Marlowe is revealed in *As You Like It*, and the reference to the "Spirit, by spirits taught to write" (*Son.* 79) would have been taken as a reference to Marlowe by the popular mind." (Letter to *TLS*, Feb. 2, 1951, p. 69.)

Although Lewis Theobald in his discussion of *King Lear* had pointed out Shakespeare's indebtedness to Dr. Samuel Harsnett's *Declaration of Egregious Popish Impostures*, and other editors have added more details, Prof. Kenneth Muir now makes a more thorough investigation of both and believes that "it may be argued that Harsnett's book contributed more to *KL* than the source-play, Holinshed, Spenser, or Sidney." Such an investigation may illustrate "the transforming power of Shakespeare's imagination." Words such as "meiny," "bo-peep," and "*Hysterica passio*," occur in both Harsnett and *Lear* and nowhere else in Shakespeare. Edmund and the dog Tray may be derived from Edmund Peacham and Trayford in the *Declaration*. Edgar's five fiends, the storm scene, and numerous parallel passages are presented with the comment that Shakespeare's borrowings "seem to have been more considerable than previous editors have realized." ("Samuel Harsnett and *King Lear*," *Rev. of English Studies*, New Series, II:5, pp. 11-21, Jan. 1951.)

By proposing the use of a small platform on the stage, possibly the dais from which the throne had been removed, Warren Smith attempts to solve some of the problems of staging that have perplexed historians of the stage and producers of the plays. Had the balcony been solely used, exits above and entrances below would have appeared in the text. Furthermore, the lines spoken indicate that either the dialogue is continuous or that insufficient time is allotted for such a descent. For example, the practical difficulty of raising Antony to a balcony (which in one performance was done by means of strips of linen wrapped around him, after which he was pushed up on the "butt-ends of halberts") would be solved by a platform on the stage. The balcony was of course used, but a "platform superimposed on the main stage," whether a permanent fixture, a movable dais, or something pushed on the inner or outer stage, seems to have been a structural necessity. (Evidence of Scaffolding on Shakespeare's Stage," *R.E.S.*, II-5, pp. 22-29, Jan. 1951.)

The quarto and folio texts of *Troilus and Cressida* have been re-examined by Alice Walker of Welcombe, Bidford (England) with interesting results. The problem concerns the provenance of the copy, the added Prologue, the additional 45 lines not in the quarto, improvements and debasements of the text, and numerous other variants in punctuation, speech assignments, and stage directions. That the quarto was used for the Folio is evident, but the remaining errors in the Folio indicate that the improved copy was not a theatrical copy but one probably made by a private transcriber. The Folio text, therefore, is not completely reliable. A new point of interest is her observation that textual changes after the first three pages indicate that the new copy with which the quarto was collated became available after the preliminary pages were set, or that they had already obtained another manuscript in which the first few pages were missing. The problem of whether the peculiar condition of *Troilus and Cressida* in the Folio was caused by a new manuscript being made available, or due to copyright, yet remains. If the latter, then the new manuscript must have come to them during the halt in printing. ("The Textual Problem of *Troilus and Cressida*," *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, XLV:4, pp. 459-64, Oct. 1950.)

The significant use of "temple-haunting martlet" in *Macbeth* (I:6.4) indicates Shakespeare's "poetic awareness of the states of the two conflicting countries—England and Scotland." St. Edward, the Confessor, is referred to as "Gracious England" by Malcolm (IV:3.189), and since his shield bearing 5 martlets might have been seen in Westminster Abbey, there may be some connection. Shakespeare must have had the heraldic as well as the domestic bird in mind—"an example of the unconscious working of Shakespeare's imagination." (B. Kingston Harris, Letter to *Times Lit. Supplement* (London), March 16, 1951, p. 165.)

J. C. Maxwell of Newcastle-on-Tyne reviews the comments on "fat and scant of breath" in *Hamlet* (V. 2-285) and brings forth new evidence that "fat" means *sweaty*. He cites Richard Johnson's *Seven Champions of Christendom* (1596-7): "The sweat of the giant's brows ran into his eyes, and by reason he was so extreme fat [sweaty] he grew so blind that he could not see to endure combat any longer." Here, too, sweat is a hazard in fighting. ("Fat and Scant of Breath' Again," *English Studies* (Amsterdam), XXXII:1, pp. 29-30, Feb. 1951.)

Bookman Associates

presents

A LOW-COST PUBLISHING PROGRAM

For scholarly and specialized
studies of interest and value.

For details write
DEPT. SH

BOOKMAN ASSOCIATES
42 Broadway, New York 4

Donald J. McGinn's assertion that Angelo is a Puritan, and his adoption of Tieck's emendation of *precise* for "preznie" (*Measure for Measure*, III:1.97) is further reinforced by Paul N. Siegel of Ripon College. Mr. Siegel declares that by taking *precise* in the Elizabethan vernacular sense of *Puritan*, and interpreting "guards" in the accepted sense of the fur trimmings which magistrates wore and were often satirized, we have further evidence of the Elizabethan satire which Prof. Oscar J. Campbell has rightly emphasized. ("Angelo's Precise Guards," *Philological Quarterly*, XXIX:4, pp. 442-3, Oct. 1950.). Cf. D. J. McGinn's "The Precise Angelo," *J. Q. Adams Memorial Studies*, 1948, pp. 129-39.)

Preserve your SNL. An annual index
will be issued.